

REMARKS

No claims are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-31 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kronz (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,196) in view of Ross (Storage over the Internet, iSCSI emerges, Brent Ross, Network World, December 4, 2000). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-31.

The proposed combination of Kronz and Ross fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1-31.

As noted in the response to the previous Office Action (the previous Office Action being mailed December 16, 2004, the response being filed March 16, 2005), claims 1 and 18 recite, "wherein the name is in a first protocol format; encoding the name into a second protocol format;" claims 7 and 14 recite, "wherein the name is in a first protocol format; an encoder to encode the name into a second protocol format;" claim 10 recites, "a decoder to decode the encoded name from the second protocol format into a name in a first protocol format;" claim 22, as amended, recites, "decoding the encoded name from the second protocol format into a name in a first protocol format;" and claim 26 recites, "wherein the name is in a first protocol format; means for encoding the name into a second protocol format."

The current Office Action on page 2 agrees that these independent claims, specifically claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 18, 22, and 26, are not anticipated by Kronz, and therefore the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of these claims has been withdrawn in the current Office Action. Further, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of dependent claim 5-6, 9, 12-13, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 30-31 is also withdrawn.

The current Office Action maintains that claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kronz in view of Ross, and incorporates these references as set forth in the previous Office Action. However, the previous Office Action only rejected dependent claims 3-4, 8, 11,

16-17, 20-21, 24-25, and 28-29 in the previous 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. Also, in the previous 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection, the Office Action relied on Kronz as supplying the elements of independent claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 18, 22, and 26 as explained under the now withdrawn 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection, and so failed to point out how Ross supplies these elements which are now admittedly not present in Kronz.

Further, independent claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 18, 22, and 26 recite that a name associated with a discovered device is encoded or decoded from a first protocol format to a second protocol format or from a second protocol format to a first protocol format. Ross fails to teach or suggest any discovered devices, and further, fails to teach or suggest encoding or decoding a name associated with the discovered device from a first protocol format into a second protocol format or from a second protocol format into a first protocol format. Therefore, Ross also fails to teach or suggest the elements recited in independent claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 18, 22, and 26, which are admittedly missing from Kronz.

Thus, the proposed combination of Kronz and Ross fails to teach all of the elements of independent claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 18, 22, and 26. Further, claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-25, and 27-31 depend from independent claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 18, 22, and 26 respectively, and therefore include all of the elements recited in the independent claims from which they depend. Hence, the proposed combination of Kronz and Ross fails to teach or suggest all of the elements recited in claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-25, and 27-31.

The Office Action on page 2 states, "In reply, assuming arguendo that Ross dos [sic] not suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kronz to encode data into the iSCSI over TCP/IP protocol as a second protocol for transmission of data. Examiner takes an Official Notice that such conversion the format between two difference protocols is so well in that art at the time the invention was made." Applicant respectfully objects to the taking of official notice, and pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, Applicant traverses the assertion of official notice and requests that the Examiner cite a reference that teaches the missing elements. If the Examiner cannot cite a reference that teaches the missing elements, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit that describes how the missing elements are present in the prior art. If the Examiner cannot cite a reference or provide an affidavit, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-31.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-31, and therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-31.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at 408-278-4041 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ROGER WOODRUFF

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6909

Date

9/13/05

By

Garth Vivier
Reg. No. 57,313

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 13 day of September, 2005.

JONATHAN FERENCSON

Name

Jonathan Ferencson

Signature